REMARKS

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 to 2, 4, and 6 to 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Riepenhoff et al. (US 6, 341, 559) in view of Itoh et al. (US 5, 412, 408). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Riepenhoff et al. in view of Itoh et al., as applied to claims 1 to 2 above and in further view of Rutherford et al. (US 4, 661, 861). Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under §35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Riepenhoff et al. in view of Kobayashi et al. (US 5, 270, 827). Claims 8 to 9 and 11 to 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ohtsuka et al. (US 6, 075, 614) in view of Kobayashi et al.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 3. Claims 8, 9, and 10 have been amended. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled without prejudice.

Reconsideration of the application based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 was rejected for being ambiguous and indefinite because the limitation "the laser power on the measure" was not recited in either parent claim as the light source. Claim 9 has been amended per the recommendations in the Office Action by replacing the "laser power" with "light intensity."

Claim 10 was rejected for being ambiguous and indefinite because the limitation "the device has at least one laser diode bar" did not relate back to the "at least one controllable light source" as recited in the parent claim. Claim 10 has been amended per the recommendations of the Office Action by rewording the limitation as "at least one controllable light source comprises at least one laser diode bar."

Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C.§112 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 3. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Riepenhoff et al. in view of Itoh et al., and in further view of Rutherford et al. (US 4, 661, 861).

Riepenhoff et al. discloses an illustration of a printing form for wet offset printing. This includes an exposure device formed by infrared laser diodes. "The necessary laser output for evaporating the moistening agent layer on the ink transferring depends on the layer thickness, the surface velocity of the printing form cylinder and the geometry of the laser." (Col. 19, Lines 29 to 32).

Itoh et al. discloses a beam recording apparatus with intensity control. As stated in the abstract, the "apparatus has a storage device for storing the image information corresponding in amount to at least three sub scan lines, and a light intensity controller for increasing and decreasing the intensity the light beam in accordance with the contents of the storage device relative to a standard intensity."

Rutherford et al. discloses compensating for the "adverse effect of dither due to spot spreading in the longitudinal direction" by reducing the spatial amplitude of dither "as the amplitude of the video signal on line 27 increases." (Col. 20, Lines 56 to 59). It also discloses that "transverse spreading of the printed spot as the light intensity level of the focused spot increases, is reduced by pulse width modulating the drive signal to the accustom-optical modulator. The pulse width is reduced as the light intensity level increases, so that the energy in each pulse. i.e. in each pel, is maintained approximately constant. This pulse width modulation sharpens the pel and reduces paper bleed." (Col. 21, Lines 10 to 18).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a method for imaging a printing form using at least one controllable light source, the method comprising the steps of:

generating a plurality of image spots at a plurality of positions on the printing form in accordance with image data in a bit field by controlled action of light on the printing form; and

controlling an intensity of the light acting at at least one of the positions of the image spots as a function of a value of a measure for the plurality of the image spots to be generated in a surrounding area of the position; in response to exceedance of a limiting value of the

measure, the intensity is increased so that a diameter of a generated printing dot is increased by a magnitude proportional to an amplitude of a relative motion between the projection point and the printing form."

Neither Riepenhoff et al, Itoh et al., nor Rutherford et al. disclose "in response to exceedance of a limiting value of the measure, the intensity is increased so that a diameter of a generated printing dot is increased by a magnitude proportional to an amplitude of a relative motion between the projection point and the printing form." Rutherford et al. specifically teaches reducing the intensity to avoid a spot spread, and clearly teaches away from the present invention. It is also respectfully submitted that there is no motivation to combine Reipenhoff et al, Itoh et al. and Rutherford et al.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims is respectfully submitted.

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under §35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Riepenhoff et al. in view of Kobayashi et al. (US 5, 270, 827).

Claim 1 now includes the limitations of claim 3 and withdrawal of this rejection of claim 1 and it dependent claim 5 is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 to 9 and 11 to 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §1203 (a) as being unpatentable over Ohtsuka et al. (US 6, 075, 614) in view of Kobayashi et al.

Claim 8 now clearly recites that the program executes the steps of claim 1, and neither Ohtsuka et al. nor Kobayashi et al. discloses these steps.

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 8, 9, 11 and 12 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

If any additional fees are deemed to be due at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: _____

William C. Gehris (Reg. No. 38,156)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940